

MARTHA'S VINEYARD COMMISSION

BOX 1447, OAK BLUFFS, MASSACHUSETTS, 02557, 508-693-3453, FAX 508-693-7894 INFO@MVCOMMISSION.ORG

Minutes of the Special Meeting of February 13, 2003

Held in the Olde Stone Building,
33 New York Avenue, Oak Bluffs, MA

IN ATTENDANCE

Commissioners: Jim Athearn, Chairman (Elected – Edgartown), John Best (Elected – Tisbury), Christina Brown (Elected – Tisbury), Linda DeWitt (Appointed – Edgartown), Jane A. Greene (Appointed – Chilmark), Tristan Israel (Appointed – Tisbury), Katherine Newman (Appointed – Aquinnah), Megan Ottens-Sargent (Elected – Aquinnah), Richard Toole (Elected - Oak Bluffs), Alan Schweikert (Appointed - Oak Bluffs), Linda Sibley (Elected - West Tisbury), Kate Warner -Appointed - West Tisbury), Andrew Woodruff (Elected -West Tisbury)

Staff: Mark London (Executive Director), Christine Flynn (Regional Planner), Jennifer Rand (DRI Coordinator), Bill Wilcox (Water Resources Planner), Bill Veno (Regional Planner)

1. BRIDGE HOUSING (DRI 560) - PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioners present for the Hearing: J. Athearn, J. Best, C. Brown, L. DeWitt, J. Greene., T. Israel, K. Newman, M. Ottens.-Sargent, R. Toole, A. Sibley, L. Sibley, K.. Warner, A. Woodruff

Representatives of the applicant: Brown Austin, Bridge Housing; Peter Wells, Vineyard Landscaping; Kent Healy, civil engineer, Isaac Russell - traffic

There being a quorum present, Christina Brown, Hearing Officer, opened the Public Hearing at 7:42 p.m. and read the Notice of Public Hearing. She indicated that the schedule was to review Bridge Housing until 9:00 p.m. and then continue the Hearing, since it is a major project that cannot be completed in one evening.

1.1 Applicant's Presentation

Brown Austin introduced the project.

- He was glad to have the opportunity to present a project that deals with the two main

problems facing the Vineyard: the need for secure, attractive and affordable housing and the desire to preserve open space.

- During the 1990's, the Vineyard added 1700 seasonal and 1000 owner-occupied homes but fewer than 50 low income units. In 2000, 2001 and 2002, 4, 1 and 6 affordable units were added respectively.
- With the cooperation of the Land Bank and the Norton family, they have come up with a proposal to take 24 acres, preserve most of it, and use the rest for an affordable housing project.
- Seven religious organizations came together to form the Housing Ecumenical Action Team (HEAT) that subsequently set up Bridge Housing, an all-volunteer, not for profit, no overhead organization. They are working with other housing groups on the Island. Their operations are partially funded by the Dukes County Affordable Housing Fund, as well as State agencies. The project is being backed by local banks, and has been enthusiastically received by several boards in Tisbury.
- This is not a typical 40b proposal in that all units are affordable by Island standards, namely 120% of median income or less or family income levels depending on family size of \$35,340 to \$70,680.
- The project will not create new traffic or school problems in that it will not draw new people to the Island; the residents are already here.
- It will stop people from being driven off island because they cannot afford housing.
- The proposed 32 homes will make a real dent in the need for affordable housing on the Island. The mixed income levels will provide diversity.
- There are four different basic 2-family plans: Farmhouse, Colonial, Cape and Ranch style; with minor variations, no two are exactly alike. Some are one-storey, most are two-storey and there are two handicapped units.
- Economics drove the need for 32 homes, but they believe that the proposal has a reasonable impact on the land.
- The houses will be modular. Although this might have the connotation of low quality, this company is the best that they could find and has been very amenable to upgrades such as Energy Star efficiency. He is impressed by quality of the product and the pride of the company.
- They intend to meet the federal Energy Star guidelines with respect to energy efficient windows, appliances, lighting, furnaces, and water heaters. There will be no site lighting except the porch lights required by code. They are looking for a location for the possible installation of a photovoltaic bank.
- Since the site is almost flat, the project can be developed with little topographic intervention.

Peter Wells described the potential development of the overall lot under existing zoning.

- He calculated that Title V regulations said there could be 104 bedrooms, for the nearly 24 acres.

- According to the zoning, there could be 14 lots that, with guesthouses, could have 85 bedrooms.
-

Brown Austin described the site plan.

- The Land Bank was interested in the back portion of the Norton Land, located next to the Land Bank's property, the Ripley's field. This is the first time that the Land Bank has participated in the conception of a project like this.
- There is a 20 foot high ridge separating the front and rear parts of the site. The houses are located nearer to the road.
- After looking at various optional site plans, they felt the proposed plan fit in best with the rural character and it saved the existing pine groves. There will also be augment of the vegetation by planting more white pines.
- The project is located on a public transit route with a special bus stop the VTA has agreed to and a woodchip walking path around the neighborhood. This should encourage use of public transit.
- Most of site is accessed with a one-way loop road that should have less impact on the neighborhood than a two-way road. There will be a community mailbox that should also reduce need to drive. The project is based on 1.5 cars per home rather than the typical 2, although extra spaces will be available.
- There will be gravel parking areas at various locations around the site, not right at front doors.
- The plan is organized around a central common that will visually tie the community together, and avoid making it look cramped.
- A panel explained the relation of the project to the context, the preservation of the neighborhood character with the scale and style of buildings.
- The summary of land uses are: 23.9 acres total site area, 16.0 acres (66.9%) would go to the Land Bank, an 7.9 acres (33.2%) would be used for housing.

Ken Healy described the septic system.

- Fourteen test holes were drilled in November that determined that the soil conditions make this a good site for on-site wells and septic. Groundwater is located consistently at a depth of 50'.
- The septic will be located in concrete chambers under the parking areas.
- The construction has to be done carefully to protect the wooded areas in order to ensure recharge of groundwater. They do not expect any site runoff. All in all, it is a good site for residential development.

Peter Wells

- The landscaping will be made up of screening around the outside of the lot made up of 30 to 60 white pines, chosen because they grow quickly and fill out well.

- The common area will be planted with native grasses.
- There will be a very limited construction area around houses with a narrow lawn, then an area of native grasses, with taller evergreens between the houses to make it seem more spacious.

Isaac Russell described the traffic study.

- The project, likely to be called Bridge Commons, will use the existing curb cut.
- It is estimated that the project will generate 340 trips per summer weekday and 380 on a Saturday, either coming and going. This assumes national averages of each household using a car 5 or 6 times per day. Since this is a Planned Urban Development, they believe that car use will be less, for example because it is more likely that people will car pool; however, they used the standard figures.
- There will be little change in traffic flow on State Road, compared to the no-build scenario for the year 2007 based on trending increases in traffic and adding the flow from the project.
- The level of service at the entrance will be C, which is widely recognized as acceptable.
- Left turns to and from site would not interfere with traffic flow on State Road.
- Sight distances are adequate both ways, although there needs to be prudent pruning of the vegetation to maintain the sight lines.
- No specific mitigation measures are required since there are no particular problems. The VTA bus stop and the community mail boxes should help reduce the number of trips.
- He is aware that the neighbors on Deer Hill Road would like to reduce the speed on State Road.

Brad Austin described the proposed ownership and schedule.

- It is proposed that there be cooperative ownership. This is a good method for placing restrictions on resale. Everyone has limited equity and people can only sell out at the same income level they buy. The coop model provides a sense of ownership and provides for owner control that will contribute to the sense of place.
- Family selection will be done on the basis of a matrix of criteria such as urgency of need, length of time on Martha's Vineyard, length in Tisbury, number of children, appropriateness of family size to available house size, occupation (e.g. public service), and community involvement.
- Since people look in May for a summer rental, they want to be ready for May 2004. This would require approval from the MVC this March or they would lose another year, and the Vineyard could lose another twenty families.
- He got involved because his daughter needed somewhere to live and even with his real estate connections, he couldn't find anything. He was able to build a guest house on his property, otherwise his daughter and grandchildren would have had to leave.
- It is a pressing regional need to keep people here and keep the community diverse.

1.2 Staff Reports (8:25 p.m.)

- **Jennifer Rand** noted that the Commissioners had received reports from several staff but suggested that the Commissioners read them later and use the time at this Hearing for the public.

1.3 Town Officials

Dennis Lopez, Tisbury Planning Board read a statement.

- The Planning Board has twice reviewed the project and now strongly endorses it. It is 100% affordable and all non-profit.
- Tisbury now has 3.4% affordable housing and with this project, will get to 5.1%; this is a big step towards the 10% goal.
- It is a good use of floor space, the design is well thought out and the access from State Road is good. It would seem invasive if it were located in an already built-up area, but in this rural area, should not pose a problem.
- They are mindful of the Town's By Law Committee's concern about the ancient way, Red Coat Hill Road, and hope the applicant will take this into consideration.

1.4 Public Testimony in Favor of the Proposal

Ted Morgan, from Edgartown, said he was concerned about affordable housing and was working with a group seeking proposals for affordable rental housing in Edgartown. He was worried about the number of school children leaving the Island. Edgartown School was planned for 550 students and is now down by 100. There is no way under present conditions that a young family can find housing. Even with this project and the Edgartown one being planned, there will still be a problem.

Casey Sharpe, from Oak Bluffs, described her personal experience with respect to housing after she returned to the Island to become Town Administrator in Oak Bluffs. Her first experience was to try to help her niece and nephew to hold onto their place. She tried to live communally, which cost her privacy and friendships. She found a nice apartment for \$1600 per month (her neighbors had 8 people in the same sized unit). She then got winter rental. She had to downsize, selling her treasured possessions. Now she lives in an apartment that is warm, sunny and bright. Scores of people have left the employ of Oak Bluffs because they couldn't afford to live here.

Liz Toomey is a member of the SHAFT action committee. She is looking for year-round housing. She has moved ten times in four years. Her daughter would like to come back here and teach after graduation but is concerned about housing. We are in danger of losing our teachers. Three weeks ago, she went to a program put on by the Housing Authority about getting housing on the Vineyard. No one there wanted a free ride; everyone wanted a mortgage. Part way through the meeting, several beepers went off and volunteer firemen left to put out a fire in someone else's house, even though they cannot afford one of their own. How much will it cost if we have to pay firemen and policemen? This proposal is not just a project; these will be people's homes.

1.5 Public Testimony with Concerns about the Proposal

Jonathon Castle lives across the street and was involved in several letters about the project. He encourages the Commissioners to look at the concerns and the constructive criticisms.

Barbara Babcock is a neighbor but probably the one who will be least affected. She asked the MVC to look at the unintended consequences of having so dense a neighborhood. They are already dealing with consequences of the Assembly of God building with drainage problems and lack of landscaping because of lack of money. It is important that all the undergrowth is not scooped away as happened with the Vineyard Assembly of God that is now an eyesore. She is not opposed to the project, but is concerned about the density.

Martin Tomassian is an attorney in Edgartown representing Ken Bilzerian who lives close to this property.

- Mr. Bilzerian is not totally opposed to the project, but he has serious concerns.
- His client is concerned about speed on State Road. He has lived there for thirty year. It wasn't a problem then but now he has to sit for 5-7 minutes waiting for an opening in the traffic to enter State Road. He also is concerned about the sight lines and feels that drivers cannot see around the corners.
- He said that Tisbury has an Island Roads District and claimed that nobody is supposed to build in this District that is 200 feet back from the road. He indicates which proposed houses are within the District.
- He noted that the traffic study was not done by a consultant. Further up State Road is considered to be a failed road. A consultant would look at the roads spilling onto State Road, traffic cuts, and nearby businesses. There are several home businesses in the area, as well as the Assembly of God, that are all perfectly legal but do generate traffic. Most people proposing a project of this scale would be required to do traffic study.
- His client feels the project is high density, an increase more than five times what the zoning allows. Normally there would be six units for this area and they propose 32. He never heard of 1.5 cars for a family and assumes there will be 2.

- Last year, Bridge had written that they were then planning 8 to 12 community units, now there are 32 units. They said there would be a 200' setback on State Road and a 100' setback from property lines. Now one building is only 75' from the roadway (i.e. 62.5% less than originally stated) and on the side is only set back 35". He realizes that plans change but this is what everyone believed would happen.
- Red Coat Hill Road is one of oldest roads on the Island. There are cuts in rocks from over 150 years ago. He realizes that some portions have already been cut off, but the question is whether development should be allowed that continues to cut it off.
- Finally, there are abutters who presently have no access to their property. If they now build a road, the Land Court could force them to give access to these formerly inaccessible properties making more lots available for development.

Tom Noble is a hydrologist with the firm Horsley and Whitten, also representing Ken Bilzerian.

- He did an initial review of the project based on the plot plan that identified two issues.
- The facility is on one lot with common ownership. They are proposing 6 wells, each proposing to serve fewer than 25 people under DEP regulations. However, since they are all on one lot, this would still be considered a public water system requiring at least a 100-foot radius around each well. Since the property is 400' x 880', once one starts placing 200 ft circles, there is not much room left to develop. If there were to be only one well, it would need a 250' radius, i.e. beyond the limits of the property.
- The site is in zone 2 of the Tisbury Public Water Supply Well. As a nitrogen-sensitive area, there should only be 4 bedrooms or 440 gallons per acre. The applicant proposes to use the nitrogen credit from the rest of property but this is not all in zone 2, only the part in zone 2 can be used. As a result, they end up with 480 gallons per acre, which is over the limit.

Jan Woodcock, lives in the neighborhood. She would support the project but the density is so high that it seems like an urban development. It would be a radical change.

Dan Seidman, lives on Mayflower Lane. Nearby, all the lots are one-acre. There are days when it takes five minutes to cross the street. He favors affordable housing. He was fortunate enough to be able to buy. His problem with this project is the scope; 32 units is a lot. With respect to the nitrogen loading, it is disingenuous talking about getting 85 bedrooms on the whole site and getting credit for the whole site since they are only talking about this property. If the density was half, it would keep the neighborhood as it is. An earlier iteration of the plan had all the development on one side of Red Coat Hill Road; that would have been better. He doesn't think 1.5 cars is credible.

Phyllis Vecchia, is Barney Zeite's wife. She realizes that there are problems of not having a place to live but fears that this project will be overwhelming for neighbors, a huge change. She said God bless you for trying to understand our point of view.

Ellen Kaplan is an attorney representing Walter Sheble who lives on the other side from Mr. Bilzerian. He is not opposed to the project and no one would dispute that there is a need for affordable housing. However, one must consider the health, safety and welfare of future residents and their neighbors. It is now very hard to exit onto State Road. The traffic report as submitted shows the entrance is now at level A and will be reduced to level C, the lowest acceptable level; if this estimate proves to be conservative, it could go to level D. She would agree with Mr. Noble that this appears to be a community water supply requiring an area of preserved land around wells that would be impossible to provide, and it would appear that the nitrogen credit is not enough. DEP should be reviewing the project and they could help sort out as to whether the water supply and septic is adequate.

Christina Brown continued the Public Hearing until 7:45 p.m. on February 20, 2003. This meeting will be primarily for Commissioners to ask questions. She invited the public to come to this session since many questions could be clarified at that meeting. She also invited the public to come to the continued Hearing on March 13 that will be another opportunity for the public to comment on the proposal.

Jim Athearn declared a recess to the Meeting at 9:12 p.m. and resumed the Meeting at 9:22 p.m.

2. TAPESTRY HOLDINGS (DRI No. 563 - SCOTTISH BAKEHOUSE) – CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioners present for the Public Hearing were: J. Athearn, J. Best, C. Brown, L. DeWitt, J. Greene, T. Israel, K. Newman, M. Ottens-Sargent, R. Toole, A. Schweikert, L. Sibley, K. Warner, A. Woodruff.

Present for the applicant were Steven Galente, owner of Tapestry Holdings, and Moira Fitzgerald, architect of the project.

Christina Brown reopened the Public Hearing that was continued from February 6, 2003.

Christina Brown reported that Land Use & Planning Committee (LUPC) had met with the applicant on Monday, February 10, 2003.

- The committee had identified three major concerns: the landscaping in front, the orientation of the building, and the location of the curb-cut and access road.
- The members had agreed that the formal planting in front was not in keeping with the character of this rural road and urged the applicant to replant the area with bushes and trees similar to those now there as well as on the abutting property, to recreate a scraggly rural look.
- With respect to the question of building orientation, some members felt that it was most important to have the building at a traditional right angle to the road; others felt that

because of shape of site and the screening, an angled orientation would be preferable.

- Finally, everyone agreed that there should be only one curb-cut, ideally where the sight lines were best while maintaining existing vegetation as much as possible. LUPC did not make a specific recommendation feeling that the applicant's traffic consultant, Andy Grant, would be best able to make a good proposal.

Steve Galente pointed out that there had also been a discussion of the roof color and of water supply.

Moira Fitzgerald described the revised proposal.

- They completed a survey done of all trees. All trees on the side will be preserved except for two locusts. In front, they will fill in with trees and bushes and can now save the four trees in the existing traffic island. Any trees removed would be replaced.
- They went back to single entrance and exit, shifted about 20 feet from the existing curb-cut. The paved part of the entrance is now shown as 35 feet wide but they are willing to narrow this as long as town permits.
- The building orientation is the same as it was before but it has been moved slightly in order to save several more trees.

There was a discussion of the curb-cut.

- **Jim Athearn** asked whether it was worth not having the best sight lines in order to save some trees.
- **Steve Galente** replied that Andy Grant has said that shifting the entrance towards the center of the property was preferable but there would not be much difference between their earlier and their present proposal in terms of sight lines. Also, moving the entrance farther Up-Island caused bigger grade and drainage problems. The driveway will be in gravel.
- **Linda Sibley** said that they might need a small retaining wall and that the biggest problem with the sight lines is not the tree or pole but is the vertical drop and curved road, so raising the access road will improve sight lines and ease acceleration.
- **Kate Warner** pointed out that the State would require that the apron be in asphalt.
- **Moira Fitzgerald presented** an option B with the curb-cut in the existing location, in case the Town of Tisbury or the State doesn't grant curb cut. This involved moving one parking space back in order to have stacking space for three cars.

There was a discussion of the building orientation.

- **Moira Fitzgerald** showed, with a movable cutout, that with a perpendicular orientation, if the building remained in its existing location, there would be no room for parking; if it was moved over, the parking would be very far from the building; to avoid cutting trees near road, they would have to move the building even further back putting the cars right next to the housing. She showed sun studies showing the impact of the two possible orientations.

She noted that the existing building is 56 feet from the road; the proposal is 61 feet from the property line and 74 feet from the road.

- **Steve Galente** said that with the building at an angle, it allows better separation between the residential and commercial functions, it creates better screening for the trucks and housing, and the third reason is solar. Also, with this solution, the vegetation screens the building from Up-Island; from Down-Island, one sees only the narrow end of the building whereas if it were perpendicular, the whole side of the building would be visible.
- **Kate Warner** commented that she wished they had worked harder to get a perpendicular scheme to work. Perhaps shifting the front and rear of the building. She thought that in the Roadside District and in New England in general, buildings were traditionally, though not always, perpendicular to the road. She also said that a building doesn't have to be oriented exactly to the true south in order to get a solar benefit.
- **John Best** saw no problem with this conclusion. He felt it was a thoughtful design, not conceived for selfish concerns, but rather for concerns about neighbors and traffic. That part of the road is curved with houses every which way. He said this seems reasonable, and he didn't want to have them go back and wait another two weeks.
- **Jane A. Greene** said that it is up to the applicant to propose and not up to us to redesign.
- **Alan Schweikert** said that the scheme blends into the hillside and he thinks they should leave it alone.
- **Richard Toole** felt that this orientation works well for this property. He noted that if this had been a purely residential project, it would not have come to the Commission.
- **Andrew Woodruff** wanted to go on record as supporting Kate's concern about the tradition of perpendicular buildings but understands that, in this case, there are issues related to solar and screening.
- **Linda Sibley** agreed that this is a little stretch of road where most of the buildings are cockeyed. She agrees that, when looking again at the Roadside District, it would be good to have guidelines on building orientation.
- **Mark London** said that this exercise has been useful in formulating criteria such as 1) perpendicular to the road, particularly where this is a predominant pattern, 2) minimizing visibility, 3) the functionality of the site use, and 4) solar orientation.

There was a discussion of the roof color.

- **Steve Galente** said that since the green had not been well liked, they now propose a gray metal roof..
- **Mark London** said that the green was attractive on the drawing, but might stand out too much in the actual context of the Roadside District.

There was a discussion of wastewater issues.

- **Steve Galente** said that the site can accommodate 885 gallons per day based on the acreage. Title V requires 440 gallons for the four bedrooms, but under Title V, there are restrictions on commercial uses. There was no category for bakeries but **Bill Wilcox**, in discussion with

engineer George Souarti talked about using about 220 gallons. The proposal fell between the pristine and SA basis, well within the guidelines for the State.

- **Bill Wilcox** received information about another bakery whose use is 200 gallons per day at the peak and 100 to 140 gallons per day and slower times, so his previous estimate is good. The apartments will probably really only use 212 gallons per day. Based on the nitrogen loading capacity, he suggested imposing a limit of 180,000 gallons per year. This is an inexpensive option in that the only cost is the installation of a meter. If this ever proves insufficient, they could later install a denitrification system, which costs about \$10,000 to install and \$1000 a year to maintain, more than he thought last time.

There was discussion of a variety of other issues.

- **Steve Galente** repeated that the two apartments would be rented year-round at affordable rates.
- **John Best** asked whether the project will meet Energy Star guidelines as the Bridge project discussed earlier this evening would. **Steve Galente** said he was not familiar with all the details but offered to respect these guidelines for the residential units. They plan on looking at the possibility of using an air exchange to use heat from the bakery ovens to help heat the apartments. **Tristan Israel** said that he is in favor of these energy restrictions but didn't want to impose an unfair burden on the applicant. Kate Warner noted that the Energy Star requirements are not very stringent and that the owner ends up saving money over time.
- **Linda Sibley** asked what would happen if the bakery failed. **John Best** said that it would revert to residential and they would have to come back to the Commission for any non-residential use. **Megan Ottens-Sargent** said that if there is a change of use, it goes to the ZBA; the change in intensity of use doesn't automatically mean that it is within the purview of the Commission but in this case, it will have to come back because "once a DRI, always a DRI".
- **Andrew Woodruff** asked about overflow parking. **Steve Galente** said that people could park in the backyard if necessary.

Hearing Officer Christina Brown closed the Public Hearing at 10:22 p.m.

Jim Athearn chaired the rest of the meeting.

Megan Ottens-Sargent moved and it was duly seconded to approve the project with the conditions discussed above.

- **Jane A. Greene** recapped the conditions:
 - accept the offer to respect Energy Star standards for the apartments,
 - accept the offer to move the building back,
 - accept the offer of new trees,
 - accept the proposed location of the curb-cut with the paved area to be narrowed if possible provided it was accepted by the Town and the State or, alternatively as proposed in plan B;

- condition that the water for interior use, be metered and be limited to 180,000 gallons per year.
- **Christina Brown** added:
 - accept the offered donation to an affordable housing fund and that the two apartments would be rented year-round at an affordable rate.
- **Linda Sibley** said that the roof should be gray since the aim is to make the project inconspicuous and for the seven months when there are no leaves on the trees, the gray roof would be preferable.
- **John Best** noted that just across the Chilmark / West Tisbury line, there is a big barn with a green roof that he likes. He thinks that we should let the applicant decide.

Jane A Greene moved and it was duly seconded to amend the motion to the effect that the applicant should have the choice of a green or gray roof. Voice vote. In favor: 7. Opposed: 2. Abstentions: 0. The amendment to the motion carried.

- **Jennifer Rand** pointed out that we do not have to list all the details of the latest plan since the plan itself will be part of the decision.
- **Linda Sibley** moved and it was duly seconded to amend the motion to the effect that there be no night lighting other than when bakery in operation and that, when replacing the landscaping, they use native cedars and black or red oaks, notably where the old curb cut was.

Roll call vote. In favor: J. Athearn, J. Best, C. Brown, L. DeWitt, J. Greene, T. Israel, K. Newman, M. Ottens-Sargent, A. Schweikert, L. Sibley, R. Toole, K. Warner, A. Woodruff. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 0. The motion carried.

3. COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

Kate Warner announced that this was her last evening as Commissioner. She had written a letter to the West Tisbury Selectmen saying that she wanted to take a leave of absence or resign, because of the great demands on her time related to the Energy grant that she had received. She had heard that the Selectmen will accept her resignation.

Several commissioners said that we would miss her a lot.

Andrew Woodruff said that the Commission is only as good as sum of its parts and that, with her expertise in architecture and energy issues and her experience with planning boards, Kate will be sorely missed.

4. UPCOMING LUPC MEETINGS AND SITE VISITS

Jennifer Rand outlined a list of upcoming meetings and site visits:

- February 19 at 9 a.m. (instead of 8 a.m.) - AT&T Site Visit, on Old Courthouse Road.
- February 26 at 8 a.m. - Hillside Village Site Visit.
- March 3 at 4 p.m. Bridge Site Visit followed by the LUPC meeting (and cocoa) at 5:30 p.m.
- March 13 at 7:30 p.m. – Bridge Public Hearing, and possible closing of the Hearing.

5. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

It was moved by Tristan Israel and duly seconded that the minutes of the Commission meeting of January 2, 2003 be adopted.

- Jim Athearn noted that on page 9, the name left blank is David Giles.
- Kate Warner noted that on page 11, where it says “1800 watt bulbs”, she actually said “18 100-watt bulbs”.
- Jane A. Greene noted that on page 5, it should say “shakes” not “shakers” and it should say “canopied carport”, not “canopy and carport”, and on page 12, the whole page is repeated and should be deleted.

Voice vote to adopt the minutes as amended. In favor: 10. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 3. The motion carried.

It was moved by Tristan Israel and duly seconded that the minutes of the Commission meeting of January 9, 2003 be adopted. Voice vote. In favor: 12. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 1. The motion carried.

The Meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Chairman

Date

Clerk-Treasurer

Date